



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,109	03/16/2001	Kaoru Shimamura	1046.1248	8921
21171	7590	02/24/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			GARG, YOGESH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/809,109	Applicant(s) SHIMAMURA, KAORU	
	Examiner Yogesh C. Garg	Art Unit 3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,11-13,16-20,23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,11-13,16-20,23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment received on 11/23/2005 is acknowledged and entered. The applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 11, 12, 16, 20, 23, and 24 are currently amended and claims 3, 4, 10, 14-15, 21-22 and 25-26 are canceled claims. Currently claims 1-2, 5-9, 11-13, 16-20, and 23-24 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.1. Applicant's arguments (see page 9 of Remarks) with respect to rejection of claims 7-10 and 16-19, under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7-10 and 16-19, under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is withdrawn.

2.2. Applicant's arguments (see pages 9-11) with respect to rejection of currently amended claims 1, 7, 11, 12, 16, 20, 23, and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated due to amendments.

3. Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the

Art Unit: 3625

references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-9, 11-13, 16-20, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leville in view of Ying, in view of Gold and further in view of Szabo et al. (US Patent 6,963,851), hereinafter referred as Szabo.

Regarding claim 1, Leville discloses a system for selling goods (a merchandising system) through a computer network (Fig 1), where the goods are a variety of elements which are different from each other and are sold one by one and the system comprises a unit storage section host computer 10) storing a unit of the variety of elements according to the number of elements and ranges to each of which a unit is applied/a data storage section storing a set of the data (page 7 lines 1821), as well as a detecting section(20) detecting the number of elements to be purchased on the basis of information of one or more elements to be purchased which is received from a purchaser(page 10, lines 8-9) and a reading section(10) reading at least one

Art Unit: 3625

unit corresponding to the elements to be purchased on the basis of the number of elements detected (page 8 lines 25-27) and a calculating section (20) calculating the purchase price by using the read at least one unit price and the number of elements calculated (page 10 lines 8-9).

Leville does not disclose a system wherein the "goods" denotes a variety of font sets, wherein the font set comprises of elements, element being a character.

However, Ying, in the same field of endeavor, that is selling goods on line teaches selling goods denoting a variety of font sets, wherein the font set comprises of elements, element being a character (see at least col.2, line 13-col.3, line 40, col.10, line 14-col.16, line 61). In view of Ying, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skilled in the art to modify the system of Leville to incorporate the features of Ying of selling goods denoting a variety of font sets, wherein the font set comprises of elements, element being a character because it will enable the users to sell and purchase fonts online and allow the users to vary the size of his letters to pack text more densely, using a variety of fonts to visually distinguish different parts of the text, for aesthetic use, art decoration, etc., as explicitly suggested in Ying (see at least col.1, line 59-col.2, line 11 and col.2, line 59-col.3, line 5).

Leville discloses a calculating section (20) calculating the purchase price by using the read at least one unit price and the number of elements calculated (page 10 lines 8-9) but combined with Ying does not teach storing plurality of units for each font set, each unit being a price per element corresponding to a range of elements to which the font set is to be applied and fist calculating section calculating the number of

Art Unit: 3625

elements belonging to a range to which the read at least one unit is to be applied and a second calculating section calculating the purchase price by using the read at least one unit and the number of elements calculated. However, in the same filed of selling and purchasing goods, Gold teaches storing plurality of units for elements, each unit being a price per element corresponding to a range of elements to which the goods being purchased is to be applied and fist calculating section calculating the number of elements belonging to a range to which the read at least one unit is to be applied and a second calculating section calculating the purchase price by using the read at least one unit and the number of elements calculated (see at least Figs.1, 2, 3, 7, 9, paragraphs 0010, 0033-0034, 0044-0046, 0053-0062 which describe that a pricing can be generated via a graphical interface in real –time, applying different types of stored business rules, such that conversion factors for different quantity breaks can be used to calculate from stored units, where each unit represent a price per element, that is if the purchase quantity increases the unit price per element falls to a lower level and so on. Thus in order to calculate a final price first calculations are done to determine the range in which the purchased quantity falls and after determining this a second calculation is done using the corresponding unit price for that range to arrive at the purchase price of the elements being purchased. In view of Gold, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have modified Leville/Ying to include the features of storing plurality of units for elements, each unit being a price per element corresponding to a range of elements to which the goods being purchased is to be applied and fist calculating

Art Unit: 3625

section calculating the number of elements belonging to a range to which the read at least one unit is to be applied and a second calculating section calculating the purchase price by using the read at least one unit and the number of elements calculated. Doing so, as explicitly suggested in Gold (see at least paragraphs 0005-0010) would allow the system in Leville/Ying to automate price management including electronic publication of price tables with step down prices for higher quantities (see Fig.7) as per the prescribed management policies to motivate buyers to purchase large quantities of goods, that is elements of font sets.

Leville does not disclose a creating section creating a supply file including data corresponding to information of the elements to be purchased by using the set of data stored in the data storage section and including data purchased by the purchaser in the past and a supplying section supplying the created supply file to the purchaser. However, in the same field of online selling and buying, Szabo teaches a creating section creating a supply file including data corresponding to information of the elements to be purchased by using the set of data stored in the data storage section and including data purchased by the purchaser in the past and a supplying section supplying the created supply file to the purchaser (see at least col.6, lines 11-41 where in the purchaser's previous shopping lists are stored and made available to him for his current shopping resulting in a new shopping list including data from the previously purchased items and any changes due to his current requirements are sent from the server to the client.). In view of Szabo, it would be obvious to one of an ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have modified

Art Unit: 3625

Leville to include the features of a creating section creating a supply file including data corresponding to information of the elements to be purchased by using the set of data stored in the data storage section and including data purchased by the purchaser in the past and a supplying section supplying the created supply file to the purchaser because, as explicitly argued in Szabo, it would provide great tool and convenience to the purchasers purchasing repetitive items in constructing shopping lists using the previously purchased shopping lists as in many instances the previously stored shopping list may be nearly complete and eliminating the need for the purchaser to start from scratch.

Regarding claim 2, Leville/Ying/Gold/Szabo teaches a system

comprising a purchase record storage section (see Leville-10) storing the number of elements purchased in the past(page 7 lines 2122)(purchasing history) and an addition section(see Leville 10) reading the number of elements purchased in the past from the purchase record storage section where the number of elements is detected by the detecting section and adding the read number to the detected number, wherein the reading section reads at least one unit applied to the element to be purchased from the unit storage section by using a result of addition by the addition section(see Leville, page 7 lines 12-25) the computer(see Leville -10) analysis adds the elements purchased in the past to the elements to be purchased to determine the price to be offered.

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Leville/Ying/Gold/Szabo discloses further comprising a data storage section storing data sets and a creating section creating a supply file including data corresponding to information of the elements to be purchased by using the set of data stored in the storage section as well as a supplying section supplying the created supply file to the purchaser and that the set of data represents sentences divided every predetermined range, wherein the data represents the range constructing sentences (see at least Ying col.2, line 21-col.3, line 6 and col.30, line 30-col.31, line 4). In view of Ying, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skilled in the art to modify the system of Leville to incorporate the features of Ying of selling goods denoting a variety of font sets, wherein the font set comprises of elements, element being a character, section storing data sets and a creating section creating a supply file including data corresponding to information of the elements to be purchased by using the set of data stored in the storage section as well as a supplying section supplying the created supply file to the purchaser and that the set of data represents sentences divided every predetermined range, wherein the data represents the range constructing sentences because it will enable the users to sell and purchase fonts online and allow the users to vary the size of his letters to pack text more densely, using a variety of fonts to visually distinguish different parts of the text, for aesthetic use, art decoration, etc., as explicitly suggested in Ying (see at least col.1, line 59-col.2, line 11 and col.2, line 59-col.3, line 5).

Regarding claim 4, Leville/Ying/Gold/Szabo teaches a system wherein the receiving section(see Leville,10) receives a supply file further including information on past purchases by the purchaser.

Regarding claim 5, the limitation that the set of data is a font set data and that a piece of the data is font data as an element of the font set data is already covered in claim 1 analyzed above.

Regarding claims 7-20 and 23-24, their limitations are closely parallel to the limitations covered in claims 1-6 above except for the limitations of a transmitting section transmitting information of one or more elements to be purchased to a seller, a receiving section receiving a price of the element to be purchased which is calculated by using at least one unit of an element determined on the basis of the number of elements to be purchased and a range to which the unit is applied and a display controlling section for displaying the received prices. Leville discloses all these limitations: a transmitting section(17) transmitting information of one or more elements to be purchased to a seller and a receiving section(170) receiving a price of the element to be purchased which is calculated by using at least one unit of an element determined on the basis of the number of elements to be purchased and a range to which the unit is applied and a display controlling section(17) displaying the received price onto a display. Therefore, claims 7-20 and 23-24 are also rejected as being unpatentable over Leville/Ying/Gold/Szabo as analyzed as above.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh C. Garg whose telephone number is 571-272-6756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 571-272-7159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yogesh C Garg', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Yogesh C Garg
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625

YCG
2/18/2006